

**WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Tuesday, August 9, 2005**

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review Board meeting was held on Tuesday, August 9, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Mr. Klee, Mr. Lane, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler and Mr. Watson. None were absent. Also present was Zoning Officer Beck and Zoning Administrator Murphy.

ARB #05-051 Murphy/434 South Henry Street – Fence – Approved.

ARB #05-064 Trench/714 Jamestown Road – Fence – Approved.

ARB

SIGN #05-028 Daily Press/1006 Richmond Road – Building Mounted Sign – Approved.

ARB

SIGN #05-029 FasMart/602 York Street – Building Mounted Sign – Approved.

ARB #05-066 G-Square Inc/218 North Boundary Street – Exterior Change (French doors and handicap ramp) – Conceptually Approved.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the consent agenda with the removal of ARB Sign #05-026 for further review and the addition of ARB #05-066 to the consent agenda as conceptually approved.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson and Mr. Klee.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

SIGNS

ARB

SIGN #05-026 Deierling Group Realty/1001-A Richmond Road – Freestanding Sign

Mr. Williams noted the sign was removed from the consent agenda due to concerns from a Board member and neighbor on the sign design. Tory Deierling, applicant was present to answer the concerns. Board members expressed their concern on the

number of fonts, the red color proposed and the repetitive words making the sign hard to read. It was noted the color proposed closely matches 3M “Tomato Red” which was not an approved color and asked the applicant if 3M “Deep Red” was an acceptable alternative to “Tomato Red”. Mr. Deierling agreed to simplify the sign by reducing the number of fonts, removing the repetitive statements and using “Deep Red”. Ben Altshuler, 222 Virginia Avenue, expressed similar concerns on the color and the design and agreed the proposed recommendations were acceptable.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB Sign #05-026 conditioned upon 3M “Deep Red” being used instead of “Tomato Red”; simplifying the sign design by reducing the number of fonts and repetitive wording with final approval of the sign design being approved by the Zoning Administrator.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson and Mr. Klee.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

ARB

SIGN #05-027 KIA/3012 Richmond Road – Monument Sign

There was no representative present. Mrs. Murphy stated the reason the sign was not on the consent agenda was because the sign base exceeded the maximum height allowed which is 50% of the sign face not to exceed eight feet. In this case, the maximum height of the sign base allowed is 18 inches.

Mr. Williams motioned to approved ARB Sign #05-027 conditioned upon the sign base being 18 inches in height with an opaque gray and white background.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson and Mr. Klee.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

ARB #05-065 American Health Evaluation Center, LLC/328 North Henry Street – New Building & Relocation of Lawson House to 411 Scotland Street

Ed Winks, Architect, Myrl Hairfield, Developer, and Dr. John Hamrick, a partner in the project presented their request noting the following:

- The proposal represents several years talking about having a state of the art health facility in Williamsburg.
- The design represents close cooperation between with Colonial Williamsburg and the City Manager over the last five years to figure out a location and to make this a top notch facility.
- It will benefit the Williamsburg community by having a medical testing area with state-of-the-art equipment and health evaluation services done by highly experienced specialists.
- The existing Lawson House will be relocated around the corner to property on Scotland Street.
- They are proposing brick building broken up into two and one story wings to blend in with the surrounding neighborhood.
- The main entrance elevation will be facing the Community Building parking lot, due to the lack of parking on North Henry Street.

Different color schemes were presented with Mr. Winks noting they preferred the all white brick version. Board members agreed with the white brick version noting a white-washed brick giving the building an aged patina would blend in with other structures in the area and break up the mass of the building.

Mr. Klee asked if the proposed stucco was real or fake. Mr. Winks stated they had not decided, but he would be willing to use real stucco if they could find someone that could install it properly. Mr. Klee noted his preference for real stucco because the fake stucco does not hold together well and looks bad. He also expressed his concern that the North Henry Street needs to have an entrance that refutes the impression that this structure effectively turns its back on Henry Street. Other Board members concurred. Mr. Winks stated he would look at alternatives and present further information at final submittal.

Mr. Williams motioned to conceptually approve ARB #05-065 condition upon the following being brought to the Board at the final approval:

- The brick on the building being white-washed.
- Careful attention and consideration being given to the entrance on South Henry St.
- Review of the landscape plan since the applicant noted that landscaping would be used to break up the mass of the building.
- Submittal of final materials and color selections for the building to include trim, roofing, siding, doors, windows, fencing and walls.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Lane, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Watson and Mr. Klee.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

Minutes July 26, 2005

The minutes were approved as presented.

Other

Design Review Guideline Subcommittee Comments & Issues for the Architectural Review Board to make recommendations and report back to the Committee

The Board discussed the following issues and agreed to make final recommendations to the subcommittee at their August 23, 2005 meeting.

Guiding Principle

The most restrictive guidelines should be adjacent to the Colonial Williamsburg Historic Area, the old campus of William & Mary, and the National Register Historic Districts of Pollard Park and Chandler Court. ***It was the consensus of the Board that the Guiding Principle was acceptable.***

Map Revisions

1. The Architectural Preservation District should be concentrated around the Colonial Williamsburg Historic Area.
 - The AP District on South Henry Street one lot south of Mimosa Drive should be changed to CP District. The boundary line adjacent to Richmond Hill, the Coves, and Port Anne should be one building lot deep from South Henry Street. ***It was the consensus of the Board that the area one lot south of Mimosa Drive to Route 199 should be designated a Corridor Protection District.***
 - Should the portion of South Henry Street between South Boundary and one lot south of Mimosa Drive be changed to CP District, or included in an AP Zone 2 or 3? The draft of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan recommends that the existing Medium Density Multifamily land use for this area (8 dwelling units/net acre) should be changed to the new Downtown Residential land use (with 8 units/net acre as the base density and an ability to increase to 22 units/net acre with a special use permit). This proposed change supports the redevelopment of this section of South Henry Street. ***A discussion on the merits of leaving this area as an AP District versus a CP District was debated. Board members agreed to consider this area and the consequences of allowing demolition of the remaining buildings without a vote by the ARB.***
 - The AP District on South England Street south of Colonial Extension Subdivision should be changed to CP District. ***Board members were in agreement with this revision.***

- The AP District on Capitol Landing Road between the Colonial Parkway and Brandywyne should be changed to CP District. The boundary line adjacent to Brandywyne should be one building lot deep from Capitol Landing Road. The AP District would remain on both sides of Capitol Landing Road between Brandywyne and Queens Creek. **Board members were in agreement with this recommendation.**
- 2. The Corridor Protection District should be revised where needed to reflect recent development.
 - Holly Hills Carriage Homes adjacent to Rt. 199 (make the CP boundary one duplex deep from Rt. 199)
 - Holly Hills Phase 1 adjacent to Rt. 199 (make the CP boundary one lot deep from Rt. 199)
 - Penniman Road (move CP/AP boundary line to follow with Penniman Road)
 - High Street Williamsburg adjacent to Richmond Road (move CP boundary line for the commercial section back to Middle Street)
 - Mooretown Road (eliminate from CP District)**Board members agreed to these recommendations.**

Text Revision

1. Architectural review should not be required for Planned Unit Developments located outside of the AP and CP Districts (Sec. 21-864). This would eliminate the requirement for architectural review for Shellis Square on Merrimac Trail, for Port Anne except for the lots along South Henry Street, and for Counselors Close. **Board members agreed with this recommendation.**

List of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas

1. The list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas includes buildings 50 years old and older located in the Architectural Preservation District. The list was prepared in December 1992, and was based on a survey of all buildings 50 years old and older. The survey needs to be updated based on the revised boundaries of the AP District.
2. The Architectural Review section of the Zoning Ordinance does not refer to a list of locally significant architecture and areas, but refers to the historical and architectural value of a building or structure. The list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas was an attempt to identify those buildings in the Architectural Preservation District with the highest historical and architectural value.
3. Should the Board update and continue to use the list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas, or instead just use the survey of all buildings 50 years old and older as a resource in evaluating requests? If the survey is used instead of the list of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas,

should the survey be supplemented by a rating of the most important buildings, such as National Register listing or eligibility?

The Board requested staff to provide several survey reports at the next meeting to determine if the reports compiled routinely and updated by the City provide enough information to identify Locally Significant Architecture and Areas based on criteria incorporated in the individual survey reports (e.g. whether a structure appears eligible for inclusion in the National or State registries of historic properties). The Board will make a final determination at the next meeting.

Architectural Preservation District Revisions – Reconfigure APD zones 1, 2 and 3

1. The most restrictive guidelines should be adjacent to the Colonial Williamsburg Historic Area, the old campus of William & Mary, and the National Register Historic Districts of Pollard Park and Chandler Court. The boundaries of the three zones should be redrawn to reflect this policy. ***Board members agreed with this recommendation.***
2. APD zone 1
 - No replacement of existing wood siding with synthetic siding. ***Board members agreed that wood siding should not be replaced with synthetic siding.***
 - Metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction. ***It was the consensus of Board members that metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction.*** Existing metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. ***Board members want to discuss this further at the next meeting to give members time to ponder the relevance of requiring wood siding for total replacement of another siding material such as vinyl, aluminum, metal, stucco and drivit.***
 - Should new construction be allowed to use synthetic siding and/or trim that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding? ***It was the consensus of Board members that synthetic siding should not be allowed for new construction in the redefined APD zone 1.***
3. APD zone 2
 - Should existing wood siding be allowed to be replaced with synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding. If so, what are the parameters?
 - If the List of Significant Structures is continued, buildings on the list could be required to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, with approval based on setback from street, amount of deteriorated siding, and/or other parameters.

- If the List of Significant Structures is replaced with a survey of buildings 50 years old and older, would review on a case-by-case basis be warranted?
- If the List of Significant Structures is replaced with a survey of buildings 50 years old or older, supplemented by identification of buildings listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register, buildings so identified could be required to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, with approval based on setback from street, amount of deteriorated siding, and/or other parameters.

It was the consensus of Board members that existing wood siding should not be replaced with synthetic siding.

- New construction can use synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding. ***It was the consensus of Board members that synthetic siding could be used for new construction.***
- Metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction. ***It was the consensus of Board members that metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction.*** Existing metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. ***Board members want to discuss this further at the next meeting to give members time to ponder the relevance of requiring wood siding for total replacement of another siding material such as vinyl, aluminum, metal, stucco and drivit.***

4. APD zone 3

- Existing wood siding can be replaced with synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding (i.e. Hardiplank, Cemplank). ***Board members wanted to discuss this further at the next meeting to determine if replacement is preferred over covering with vinyl siding (in order to encapsulate and preserve the original siding)***
- Vinyl siding meeting certain quality standards can be approved on a case-by-case basis. Review current standards for vinyl siding and amplify if necessary. ***The Board was in agreement with this recommendation for new construction.***
- Metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding shall not be allowed for new construction. ***It was the consensus of Board members that metal siding, stucco and drivit, and aluminum siding shall not be allowed for new construction.*** Existing metal siding, stucco and drivit, aluminum and vinyl siding may be replaced in kind. ***Board members want to discuss this further at the next meeting to give members time to ponder the relevance of requiring wood siding for total replacement of another siding material such as vinyl, aluminum, metal, stucco and drivit.***

Corridor Protection District

1. Should the current unified standard for building design be continued?
 - Major buildings should be constructed of brick or brick and horizontal siding that is wood or a synthetic siding that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding.
 - Prefabricated metal buildings shall not be allowed.
 - Aluminum siding, vinyl siding and sheeted siding shall not be allowed.
 - Applied stucco is not acceptable as a primary building material, but may be used as an accent material on buildings of contemporary design or in renovations.

Board members strongly agreed that the current building design standard should be continued to maintain and improve the architectural and visual character of the entrance corridors into the City.

2. Should there be a specific standard for residential uses in the CP District?
 - Other than Jamestown Road, residential uses in the CP District are duplexes, apartments and condominiums, which are adequately handled by the existing guidelines. There have been no problems in dealing with the single-family residential buildings on Jamestown Road.

Board members agreed that a separate standard for residential and commercial areas and uses in the Corridor Protection District was not necessary. The focus on the Corridors is the general visual character of the areas into the City, not one use versus another use.

3. Should there be a different standard for different sections of the CP District, such as Jamestown Road west of Rt. 199?
 - Are there any issues other than the use of vinyl siding?
 - If vinyl siding is the only issue:
 - Are there areas of the CP District where vinyl siding would be appropriate?
 - If there are areas where vinyl siding would be appropriate, should a specific quality of vinyl siding be required?

Board members strongly agreed that standards should be the same for all properties located in the Corridor Protection District and that one side of a street was just as important as another side if located in the City.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

Jason L. Beck
Zoning Officer